



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/477,954	01/05/2000	JONATHAN LEE SULLIVAN		9970

7590 08/01/2002

DENNIS L THOMTE
801 GRAND AVENUE
SUITE 3200
DES MOINES, IA 50309

EXAMINER

HARRY, ANDREW T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2684

DATE MAILED: 08/01/2002

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

09477954 1/5/00 Jonathan Sullivan

EXAMINER	
Andrew T. Harry	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2684

9

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jonathan Sullivan (3) Daniel Hunter
(2) Dennis Thonite (4) Andrew Harry

Date of interview 7/3/02

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☒ was not reached.

Claims discussed: All, primarily claim 5

Identification of prior art discussed: Mota; U.S. patent 6,064,863, Chang U.S. Patent 6,171,123

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussion centered around the use of Mota; as prior art to be used for the rejection of claimed invention. It was explained by the Examiner that the incorrect area of Mota; was cited in the rejection, and that Mota; does read on the claimed invention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☐ 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

DANIEL HUNTER

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Examiner's Signature